

REMARKS

1. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Examiner's comments, which have greatly
5 assisted Applicant in responding.

2. 35 U.S.C. §102(e). The Examiner stated that Claims 1-10, 12-32 remain rejected
under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Win et al (6,161,139).

10 Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant respectfully points out to the Examiner that the Win system makes a go/no-go
decision for access to the resource by the user. In stark contrast, in the claimed
invention, the Resource makes the go/no-go decision for access.

15

Also, in Win, there is one actor, an administrator, making associations between users
and resources. In stark contrast, in the claimed invention, the association of Job Profile
to Resource Profile is a negotiation that requires the approval of the Resource Owner.
Two actors, the Workgroup Manager and the Resource Owner negotiate the
20 association. Resource Owner actor can't manage the User objects in the Job Profile
and the Workgroup Manager actor can't manage the Resource object. Hence the
claimed invention comprises a technique which supports separation of duties and
concerns for security and audit purposes, unlike the prior art of reference.

25 Support can be found in the previous office action citations and in the Figures.

Claim 1

Amended Claim 1 appears as follows.

30

1. (currently amended)A method for requesting approval for accessing a
resource in a system of resources, comprising the steps of:

creating a resource profile including at least one resource, wherein said at
least one resource profile has an owner;

a manager creating a job profile that is related to including at least one user object construction, said object construction representing a job function or functions;

said manager requesting of said resource owner approval for access by said job profile to said at least one resource;

responsive to said resource owner granting approval, assigning said job profile to said resource profile; and

requesting once that said resource owner approve said job profile to access said resource profile, such that any user subsequently assigned to said job profile by said manager automatically gains approval and access to said at least one resource included in said resource profile.

The Examiner stated that Win anticipates Claim 1 and cited parts of cols. 3, 4, and 5.

Applicant respectfully points out the following.

Col. 3, lines 66-67 does not teach all the limitations of Claim 1. Such cited lines describe a technique for controlling access to protected information. Such lines do not explain the approval process for getting access to protected information, as does the claimed invention.

Regarding Col. 4, such column describes the systems required for access control, either all components of the system are in one server or distributed among several; it describes the redundancy of the registry servers; it explains users and roles assigned to them; and it explains resources such as a web application (source of information) being accessed via a URL, and other examples such as complete web site and web-enabled database.

It should be appreciated that nowhere in Col. 4 does Win teach 'requesting approval for a job profile comprising object constructs, such as jobs, roles, projects, and the like, to access a resource', as in Claim 1. According to the claimed invention, before an object can be granted access to one or many resources, the object is authorized for that access by the Resource owner. The Resource owner agrees to the object's access to his/her resource. Once the Resource owner agrees to that access, then, the object is authorized to access the resource and then the present and subsequent users who assume the object can access the resource.

It should further be appreciated that nowhere in Col. 5 does Win teach 'requesting of said resource owner approval for access by said job profile to said at least one resource', where the job profile comprises at least one object construct. Again, here

5 Win discusses how an administrator grants access.

Nevertheless, Applicant has amended the independent claims to further clarify the invention.

10 Independent Claims 10, 20, 22, 26, 29, and 32 have been similarly amended. Therefore, in view of the discussion hereinabove, Applicant respectfully points out that Win does not teach every limitation of the claims. Accordingly, Applicant is of the opinion that Independent Claims 1, 10, 20, 22, 26, 29, and 32, and hence the respective dependent claims, are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant respectfully
15 requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

3. It should be appreciated that Applicant has elected to cancel and amend the Claims solely for the purpose of expediting the patent application process in a manner consistent with the PTO's Patent Business Goals, 65 Fed. Reg. 54603 (9/8/00). In
20 making such cancellation and amendment, Applicant has not and does not in any way narrow the scope of protection to which Applicant considers the invention herein to be entitled. Rather, Applicant reserves Applicant's right to pursue such protection at a later point in time and merely seeks to pursue protection for the subject matter presented in this submission.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Applicant considers the present invention to be distinguished
5 from the art of record. Accordingly, Applicant earnestly solicits the Examiner's
withdrawal of the rejections raised in the above referenced Final Office Action, such that
a Notice of Allowance is forwarded to Applicant, and the present application is therefore
allowed to issue as a United States patent. The Examiner is invited to call to discuss
the response. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees
10 due or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 07-1445.

Respectfully Submitted,

15



Julia A. Thomas,

Reg. No. 52,283

Customer No. 22862